DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 177 657 CS 502 680

AUTHOR Tubbs, Stewart L.; Gritzmacher, Karen J.
TITLE Supervisory Communication and Organizational Effectiveness: Past, Present, and Future Research Issues.
PUB DATE Nov 79
NOTE 19p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (65th, San Antonio, TX, November 10-13, 1979)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Aggression; Assertiveness; *Communication Skills; Language Patterns; *Organizational Communication; *Organizational Effectiveness; Performance Factors; Sex Differences; Sex Stereotypes; Speech Communication; *Supervisory Methods
IDENTIFIERS *Communication Research

ABSTRACT

This paper explores the relationship between communication style and organizational effectiveness. The first section of the paper reviews eight empirical studies that illustrate the importance of communication style in organizational effectiveness. The second section of the paper discusses management functions and particular communication styles in terms of assertiveness, aggressiveness, nonassertiveness, language patterns, and sex differences. The final section presents research questions for further study. (Author/RL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED177657

SUPERVISORY COMMUNICATION AND ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS: PAST, PRESENT, AND FUTURE RESEARCH ISSUES

Stewart L. Tubbs and Karen J. Gritzmacher

General Motors Institute

Flint, Michigan 48502

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Stewart L. Tubbs
Karen J. Gritzmacher

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Paper presented to Speech Communication Association Convention, Applied Communication Section, November, 1979

CS502680

Abstract

SUPERVISORY COMMUNICATION AND ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS:

PAST, PRESENT, AND FUTURE RESEARCH ISSUES

This paper explores the relationship between communication style and organizational effectiveness. The first section of the paper reviews past and present research on this topic. Eight empirical studies are reviewed and illustrate that communication style is an important factor in organizational effectiveness. The second section of the paper discusses particular communication styles issues and management functions. These issues include: (1) communication style in terms of assertiveness, aggresiveness, and non-assertiveness, (2) communication style and language patterns, and (3) communication style differences between males and females. The final section presents future research questions which need to be investigated. Overall, the paper presents a representative view of past, present, and future research on communication style and organizational effectiveness.

While organizational effectiveness is obviously a result of a constellation of various forces, we have found that communication plays a significant part in contributing to or detracting from total organizational effectiveness. Not only is it vital for organizations to communicate effectively with their external environment, as the research of Lawrence and Lorsch (1969) clearly shows, but internal communication effectiveness is also critical. Organizations need accurate and timely information about what is going on in their relevant environments, but they also need the internal capability to process this information. This paper includes a review of eight studies we have conducted in the past decade to more specifically document the role of internal communication as a contributor to total organization effectiveness.

As we well know, Chester Barnard (1938) wrote that "the first executive function is to develop and maintain a system of communication." (p.82) Since then, numerous attempts have been made to support that assertion. Lull, et.al. (1955) surveyed the presidents of 100 of the largest corporations in the United States. He found that 96 percent believed that there was a "definite relationship" between communication and employee productivity. These findings were reaffirmed in a study by Zelko and Dance (1965) who wrote:

> When managers and other responsible persons in business organizations are asked how much of the work day is spent in communicating, the replies range from about 88% to 99%, with most saying that it is above 90%. (p.21)

Again, when Alpander (1974) surveyed 217 corporations to determine their highest priority training needs for managers currently employed, oral communication abilities rated highest as a needed supervisory skill. Tompkins (1977) even went so far as to state that communication and management are more or less synonymous. This viewpoint seems reasonable since a survey of 62 communication scholars conducted by Minter (1968) showed that their preferred definition of communication was that offered by Reusch and Bateson (1951) which states that,

> Communication does not refer to verbal, explicit, and intentional trans mission of messages alone. . . . The concept of communication would include all those processes by which people influence one another. . . . This definition is based upon the premise that all actions and events have communicative aspects, as soon as they are perceived by a human being; it implies, furthermore, that such perception changes the information which an individual possesses and therefore influences him. (pp.5 and 6)

If we believe that communication is important to organizational success, then it becomes important to specify which types of supervisory or management behaviors are seen as "communicating the message" which ultimately influences employees to perform effectively. Using such terms as "communication satisfaction" (Downs, et.al., 1974) and "communication climate" (Dennis, et.al., 1974; Dennis, 1975), a number of researchers have attempted to accomplish this task. Our own research efforts have paralleled those of Dennis and his colleagues. Our efforts have been to try to improve supervisory communication in a number of studies and to monitor the level of communication satisfaction as well as other indicators of organizational effectiveness. The following is a review of the findings from those research efforts. Let us now review our own research findings.

Study Number 1

Hain (1972) conducted a two-year study with pre and post measures of employee attitudes and plant operating performance (profitability). This study investigated the amount of change which took place among 78 salaried groups (N in each group ranged from 6-45) from four different plants employing two different technologies. He found that employee ratings of managements' communication improved as a result of this organizational change study. Management communication was measured in part by the following:

> Upward Communication - How receptive are those above you to your ideas and suggestions?
>
> Lateral Communication - How are differences between units handled? To what extent do different units or departments plan and coordinate their efforts? How are problems among departments handled?

Downward Communication - To what extent are you told how to do your job? How are decisions made and objectives set? To what extent is information shared?

It was found that the organizational change effort did succeed in significantly improving ratings of management communication. In addition, the one organization which showed the greatest improvement in management communication, also showed the greatest improvement in production performance and profitability during this two year period.

Study Number 2

Hain and Widgery (1973) then conducted a study in which employees were asked to rate their "ideal" supervisor (characteristics they would like their supervisor to possess) and their "real" supervisor (actual characteristics perceived in their supervisors). The difference between these two ratings constituted a "relative leadership deficiency" index which was then correlated with employees' satisfaction with their (1) job, (2) immediate supervisor, (3) work group, (4) company, and (5) pay. The study found a highly significant correlation between the "relative leadership deficiency" index and measures of satisfaction ($r = -.61$, $N = 700$). Leadership dimensions measured in this study included Likert's (1967) factors of support, team building, goal emphasis and work facilitation. The correlation between "relative leadership deficiency" and "communication effectiveness" (operationally defined the same as in Study Number 1) was also highly significant. ($r = -.76$, $N = 700$).

Study Number 3

Hain and Tubbs (1974) surveyed 350 employees in five departments of a large organization. Employees again rated the communication effectiveness of their superiors using the same measures as in studies 1 and 2. Data from these departments were obtained on three operating performance variables: (1) grievances, (2) absenteeism and (3) efficiency. Correlations between

communication effectiveness scores and the rankings of the five departments on these three variables showed significant positive relationships between communication effectiveness and high rankings on all three performance indicators.

Study Number 4

In study Number 3 a significant relationship was observed between the attitudinal measures of communication effectiveness and performance measures. In this study, Hain (1974) sought to determine the relationship between several behavioral measures (e.g., absenteeism, grievances, turnover, etc.) and such performance measures as efficiency and profitability. The intent of the study was to (1) determine the magnitude (if any) of the relationship between the behavioral measures and effectiveness of operating performance, and (2) to determine the relative contribution of these behavioral measures against performance data.

The study was conducted in a large manufacturing plant with data from the entire plant population of over 2,000 employees analyzed from monthly reports over a five year period. Results indicated that a significant relationship existed between behavioral and performance measures. What follows are the predictors in order of relative contribution as determined by stepwise regression procedure (multiple r = .84. Percent of variance explained = 72%).

Non-Machine Downtime	30%
Absenteeism	16%
Hourly Overtime Labor Costs	10%
Grievances	9%
Number of Hourly Employees	7%
	72%

From these figures, it is clear that overall organizational performance is directly influenced by employee performance and our other studies show that employee performance is directly influenced by management communication behaviors.

Study Number 5

Widgery and Tubbs (1975) conducted a major organizational change and development effort in which a random sample of 250 salaried employees were surveyed out of a population of 1,200. Communication effectiveness was once again measured pre and post with a year and a half interval between surveys. Significant positive changes in attitude occurred as a result of the intervention. In addition, the organization showed significant reductions in absenteeism and increased productivity.

Study Number 6

Tubbs and Judkins (1978) conducted a study measuring communication effectiveness in two comparable plants in a division of a large company. One plant was the most productive with the highest level of product quality, while the other plant had the lowest product quality in the division. The study showed significantly higher ratings of communication effectiveness in the more productive plant.

Study Number 7

Tubbs and Widgery (1978) reported the results of a two-year study they conducted in which communication effectiveness was measured pre and post with a communication improvement program conducted in the interim. Not only were significant improvements shown in communication effectiveness, but the organization was able to document a seven million dollar savings in reduced scrap and absenteeism over the course of the study. In addition, the plant moved from 15th ranked to the third best ranked plant in its division based on operating performance.

Study Number 8

Tubbs and Porter (1978) surveyed 121 randomly selected employees of a large automotive assembly plant. Data were also collected on the grievance

activity of these same individuals. Stepwise regression analysis was used to determine the predictive ability of eight factors as they related to grievance activity. These factors were (1) communication style, (2) overall satisfaction, (3) economic benefits and security, (4) working conditions, (5) regular overtime, (6) job, (7) union management relations, and (8) bargaining power.

The eight variables taken together accounted for 22 percent of the total variance. The factor which was the single best predictor was communication style which accounted for 17 percent of the variance. The second best predictor was union-management relations which accounted for 3.8 percent of the total variance. These two variables alone accounted for 20.8 percent of the 22 percent variance explained. In other words, the other six variables added little.

To highlight the significance of this finding, let us look at the survey items which comprised the variable of communication style. They are the following:

1. To what extent is your supervisor friendly and easy to talk to?	1	2	3	4	5
2. When you talk with your supervisor, to what extent does he pay attention to what you are saying?	1	2	3	4	5
3. To what extent is your supervisor willing to listen to your problem?	1	2	3	4	5
4. How much does your supervisor encourage people to give their best effort?	1	2	3	4	5
5. To what extent does your supervisor show you how to improve your performance?	1	2	3	4	5
6. To what extent does your supervisor maintain high standards of performance?	1	2	3	4	5
7. How receptive are those above you to your ideas and suggestions?	1	2	3	4	5

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree
8. My immediate supervisor treats everyone fairly.	1	2	3	4	5
9. My immediate supervisor is interested in listening to what I have to say.	1	2	3	4	5
10. My immediate supervisor is one of the best people to work with.	1	2	3	4	5
11. I respect my immediate supervisor as a leader.	1	2	3	4	5

From our consulting experience and our research, we have generally observed that managers receive considerable information on the physical and financial assets of their organization. However, the information base for managing their human assets is usually less extensive. The unusual aspect of this situation is that human or labor costs usually represent the single largest expense item for most organizations. Consequently, a manager's ability to capitalize and thus effectively utlize the human resources lags considerably behind his or her ability to effectively manage the physical or financial resources. The reason is that managers often lack the communication abilities to manage their people to an optimium degree.

The results of our eight studies are summarized in Table 1. Taken together they provide consistent and strong support for the assumption that management communication behaviors do play a significant part in contributing to or detracting from total organizational effectiveness. As we continue to specifically study the dynamic relationships between management communication and organizational effectiveness, we hope to eventually develop a communication forecasting index (CFI) which may serve as a leading indicator of organizational performance similar to leading economic indicators used by businesses today. Once developed, such an index could also serve as a measure for comparing various organizational units (e.g., departments, plants or divisions) with the goal that top managers could better analyze the total effectiveness of their organizational units.

TABLE I

RESEARCHERS	FINDINGS	CRITERION	N
Hain, 1972	Support	Efficiency	760
Hain and Widgery, 1973	Support	Job Satisfaction	700
Hain and Tubbs, 1974	Support	Absenteeism, Efficiency, Grievances	350
Hain, 1974	Support	Efficiency	2,000
Widgery and Tubbs, 1975	Support	Efficiency	250
Tubbs and Widgery, 1978	Support	Efficiency	240
Tubbs and Judkins, 1978	Support	Product Quality	220
Tubbs and Porter, 1978	Support	Grievances	121

The first section of the paper reviewed past and recent studies of communication style contributing to organizational effectiveness. This section will discuss specific issues which have become important in understanding communication style. The three specific issues which have evolved are: (1) communication style in terms of assertiveness, aggressiveness, and non-assertiveness, (2) communication style determined by verbal or nonverbal behaviors, and (3) communication style as affected by male or female behaviors. All three issues are interrelated and may vary in management style. The final section will present research questions concerning these issues and their relationship with the management function. After these sections, the case for further investigation of management factors which affect organizational effectiveness will be established.

With the recent focus on rights of individuals in education, government, business, and other areas, the significance of assertive behavior has emerged. Although behavior therapists have been investigating assertive behavior for many years, only recently has assertive behavior been recognized outside of the clinical setting. Individuals may use assertiveness to improve relations in daily interactions. The ability to express disagreement, anger, or delight freely without guilt or self-debasing behavior is considered by Alberti (1977) to be healthy.

Since 1970 assertiveness research has increased dramatically. With this new interest, however, have come theory and research problems. One problem is the lack of consenual validation of the meaning of assertiveness. Eisler Miller, and Hersen (1973) state that assertiveness is a complex construct involving component behaviors. Andersson (1976) reviews assertiveness as a personality construct. Norton and Warnick (1976) associate assertiveness with communication style. Rich and Schroeder (1976) expand the approach that assertiveness is a skill. The position of this paper will use the Alberti and

Emmons' concept which defines assertiveness by distinguishing three behaviors: non-assertive, assertive, and aggressive. These major behaviors simplify the concept of assertiveness as a skill and a communication style.

Alberti and Emmons (1974) define assertiveness as:

> Behavior which enables a person to act in his own best interests, to stand up for himself without undue anxiety, to express his honest feelings comfortably, or to exercise his own rights without denying the rights of others we call assertive behavior. (p. 2)

As stated, they distinguish assertive, non-assertive and aggressive behaviors. They believe an assertive individual can make appropriate self-fulfilling responses. The individual generates positive feelings to onesself and others; this leads to effective interpersonal relationships. The non-assertive individual does not stand up for one's rights and exhibits self-denying and negative feelings to onesself and others. Finally, the aggressive individual does not recognize other's rights and displays offensive hostile behaviors to others. The non-assertive and aggressive styles have a tendency to create greater strain in relationships. Alberti and Emmons recommend the assertive style as being most functional, however, an individual should develop an adaptive communication style which creates a repertoire of appropriate responses in various settings. The use of assertiveness, aggressiveness, and non-assertiveness is one way of defining and varying communication style.

These communication styles can be analyzed on the verbal and nonverbal levels. The development of appropriate verbal skills is significant in management development. As Tubbs and Gritzmacher (1978) reveal, organizations recognize the need for effective communication skills and select competent personnel with interpersonal skills. The appropriate language is a factor in communication style but the appropriate nonverbal behavior is also significant.

Alberti and Emmons (1974) stress the verbal components of assertiveness, aggressiveness, and non-assertiveness but Sansbury (1974) explains that

assertive behavior involves nonverbal, vocal, and verbal skills. Eisler, Hersen, and Miller (1973) and Serber (1972) define levels of assertiveness by nonverbal components such as eye contact, voice loudness, affect, and expressiveness. These authors argue that it is of major importance to sound assertive as well as look or behave assertively. Whiteley and Flowers (1978) and Dawley and Wenrich (1976) also recognize the significance of the nonverbal component. Thus, the equal importance of verbal behavior and nonverbal behavior in determining communication style is established.

One of the aspects of supervisor communication and style that is receiving increasing attention in the literature is the study of sex differences in communication patterns. With more women being promoted into upward mobile jobs in corporations, researchers are beginning to ask questions like, "What differences, if any, exist in the communication patterns of men and women in supervisory positions?" The increasing interest in assertive training for women suggests that it may be important for women to communicate a certain way to "make it" among the supervisory ranks. Differences in language patterns may give us further clues as to why some supervisors are more effective in their communications than others.

When the small body of literature related to sex differences and supervisory effectiveness is reviewed, again, many of the sex-stereotypic images concerning men and women emerge. A frequent reservation concerning the movement of women into management is that they do not have the right temperament for such jobs (Bowman, Wortnery and Greyser, 1965). Women supposedly lack the toughness, objectivity and strength necessary to confront difficult managerial situations. Men are considered to be assertive, while women are described in terms of their deference to authority and their willingness to "back down" rather than hurt someone's feelings (Loring and Wells, 1972). Recognizing the importance of sex differences in communication style and organizational effect-

iveness is necessary.

When discussing management, the basic job demands of planning, organizing, motivating, and controlling always emerge. Each function implies certain behavioral and communication patterns which may influence organizational effectiveness. It is important to understand each function. The planning function involves the setting of goals and objectives for the organization. The organizing function requires identifying and merging resources. The motivating function determines the level of performance of employees and how effectively organizational goals would be met. Finally, controlling function attempts to create feedback of results and the adjustment of necessary resources. These functions help the manager get things done with and through people.

The communication style used in each function becomes a major contributor to organizational effectiveness. The previous section discussed specific issues influencing communication style. This final section proposes needed research. The future understanding of communication style and organizational effectiveness may be dependent on these issues.

1) Management functions and communication style (assertiveness, aggressiveness, and non-assertiveness):
   a) What communication style is most effective for each specific management function (planning, controlling, motivating, organizing)?
   b) What determines when assertiveness, aggressiveness, or non-assertiveness is used in each function?
   c) How does the communication style vary when a situation demands the combination of management functions?
2) Management functions and verbal or nonverbal behaviors:
   a) What are the language patterns used in each management function?

b) Does the language pattern vary greatly depending of the communication style and the particular management function?

c) What are the verbal and nonverbal behaviors which determine communication style (assertiveness, aggressiveness, or non-assertiveness) when performing one of the management functions?

3) Management functions and male/female behaviors:

a) Are management functions influenced by sex of manager? (e.g., Are men more effective in controlling function vs. women?)

b) Does sex of manager vary communication style when performing particular management functions?

c) Does sex of manager change verbal patterns when performing planning, controlling, motivating, or organizing function?

d) Do men and women managers have different communication styles in the management functions?

4) Management functions and organizational effectiveness:

a) How do the issues of communication style, verbal/nonverbal patterns, sex of manager, and management functions interrelate to determine organizational effectiveness?

In this paper we have reviewed recent studies which suggest the important causal link between communication style of a manager/supervisor and the total organizational effectiveness. In addition, we have identified areas for future research. We feel that communication scholars can and should play a major role in determining the answers to these research questions.

References

Alberti, R.E. Assertiveness: innovations, applications, issues. San Luis Obispo, California: Impact, 1977.

Alberti, R.E. and Emmons, M.L. Your perfect right: a guide to assertive behavior. Second Edition. San Luis Obispo, California: Impact, 1974.

Alpander, G. "Planning Management Training Programs for Organizational Development," Personnel Journal, 33 (January, 1974), pp. 15-25.

Andersson, G. Towards a unifying theory of assertiveness. Assert: The Newsletter of Assertive Behavior, 1976, 10, 2.

Barnard, Chester I. The Functions of the Executive (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1978).

Bowman, G., Wortney, N.B., and Greyser, S.H. "Are Women Executives People?" Harvard Business Review, (1965, 43, 14-28, 164-178, 1965)

Dawley, Harold H. and W.W. Wenrich. Achieving Assertive Behavior (Monterey, California: Brooks/Cole Publishing, 1976.

Dennis, Harry S., Gary M. Richetto, and John M. Wiemann. "Articulating the Need for an Effective Internal Communication System: New Empirical Evidence for the Communication Specialist," paper presented at the annual convention of the International Communication Association, in New Orleans, (April, 1974).

Dennis Harry S. "The Construction of a 'Managerial Communication Climate' Inventory for Use in Complex Organizations," paper presented at the annual convention of the International Communication Association, in New Orleans, (April, 1974).

Downs, Cal, Michael Hazen, William Medley, and James Quiggins. "A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis of Communication Satisfaction," paper presented at the annual convention of the International Communication Association, in New Orleans, (April, 1974).

Gritzmacher, Karen J. and Stewart L. Tubbs and John W. Baird. "Supervisory Styles in an Organization: Sex and Language Differences," a paper presented at the Ohio Speech Communication Association, October 6-7, 1978.

Gritzmacher, Karen J. and John W. Baird. "Assertiveness and Management: Sex and Language Differences," a paper presented at the Conference on Communication, Language, and Sex, Bowling Green State University, May 20-21, 1978.

Hain, Tony. "Determinants of Changes in Supervisory Styles: An Empirical Test," a paper presented at the annual convention of the Midwest Academy of Management, South Bend, (April, 1972).

Hain, Tony. "The Development of a Behavioral Forecasting Index," unpublished technical report, General Motors Corporation (Detroit, Michigan, 1974).

References con't.

Hain, Tony and Robin Widgery. "Organizational Diagnosis: The Significant Role of Communication," a paper presented at the annual convention of the International Communication Association, in Montreal, (April, 1973).

Hain, Tony and Stewart L. Tubbs. "Organizational Development: The Role of Communication in Diagnosis, Change and Evaluation," a paper presented at the annual convention of the International Communication Association, in New Orleans, (April, 1974).

Hersen, M. Eisler, R.M., and Miller, P.M. Development of assertive responses: clinical, measurement and research considerations. Behavior Research and Therapy, 1973, II, 505-521.

Lawrence, Paul and Jay Lorsch. Developing Organizations (Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1969).

Likert, Rensis. The Human Organization (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967).

Loring, R. and Wells, T. Breakthrough: Women in Management. New York: Van Nostrand Runhold, 1972.

Lull, Paul, Frank Fund, and Darrell Piersol. "What Communication Means to the Corporation President," Advanced Management, 20, (March, 1955), pp. 17-20.

Minter, Robert. "A Denotative and Connotative Study in Communication" Journal of Communication, 18, (March, 1968), pp. 26-36.

Norton, R.W. and Warnick, B. Assertiveness as a communication construct. Human Communication Research, 1976, 3 (1), 62-66.

Reusch, Jurgen and Gregory Bateson. Communication: The Social Matrix of Psychiatry (New York: Norton, 1951).

Rich, A.R. and Schroeder, H.E. Research issues in assertiveness training. Psychological Bulletin, 1976, 83 (6), 1081-1096.

Sansbury, D.L. Assertive training in groups. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1974, 53, 117-122.

Serber, M. Teaching the nonverbal components of assertive training. Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry, 1972, 3, 81-86.

Tompkins, Phillip K. "Management Qua Communication in Rocket Research and Development," Communication Monographs, 44, (March, 1977), pp. 1-26.

Tubbs, Stewart L. and Karen J. Gritzmacher. "Supervisory Communication As A Contributor to Organizational Success," a paper presented at the Speech Communication Association convention, Minneapolis, (November, 1978).

Tubbs, Stewart L. and John W. Baird. "Communication of the Job," Ch. 6 in Stewart L. Tubbs and John W. Baird, The Open Person (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1976).

Tubbs, Stewart L. and Sylvia Moss. "Organizational Communication," Ch. 12 in Human Communication (New York: Random House, 1978).

References con't.

Tubbs, Stewart L. and Josephine M. Judkins. "Quality Motivation Through Employee Feedback," unpublished technical report, General Motors Corporation (Detroit, Michigan, 1978).

Tubbs, Stewart L. and Robert G. Porter, "Predictors of Grievance Activity," unpublished technical report, General Motors Corporation (Detroit, Michigan, 1978).

Tubbs, Stewart L. and Robin N. Widgery. "When Productivity Lags, Check At The Top: Are Key Managers Really Communicating?", Management Review 67, (1978), pp. 20-25.

Whiteley, John M. and John V. Flowers. Approaches to Assertion Training (Monterey, California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company, 1978.

Widgery, Robin N. and Stewart L. Tubbs. "Using Feedback of Diagnostic Information as an Organizational Development Strategy," a paper presented at the annual convention of the International Communication Association, in Chicago, (April, 1975).

Zelko, Harold and Frank E. X. Dance. Business and Professional Speech Communication (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965).